

## Summaries of Departments and Issues Not Addressed Elsewhere

### During Issue Identification

---

#### Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) – Summary

**Staff:** Meg Moorehead

**Summary:** Excluding the transfer of one staff person to OED, OSE's proposed budget reflects a funding reduction of roughly 8% for 2011, and then sustained support into 2012. The spending reductions associated with this cut do not have significant policy impacts and have not been identified for further analysis. However, the City's success in securing a \$20 million federal Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block (EECB) grant for a neighborhood-based building retrofit program does create two potential issues:

1. Although this grant does not appear in OSE's proposed 2011-2012 budget because it was 2010 award, the program will be a significant part of OSE's work over the next two years. Given the importance of this project and its ambitious schedule, Council may want to request progress reports at key milestones, such as at its public roll-out in February/March 2011 and in September before Council budget review. The progress reports could be requested through a 2011-2012 Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) or as an element of the Council's 2011 Work Plan.
2. A new staffing plan and work plan for the grant-funded work was submitted to Council on October 13. Staff review of this new proposal may identify staffing or work task issues that warrant a budget action.

---

#### Personnel Department – Summary

**Staff:** Patricia Lee

**Summary:** The Personnel Department was given a 9% reduction target from the baseline budget which was met through staffing reductions, reclassifications to non-supervisory titles and reductions from full to part-time positions. There will be 10.25 fewer FTEs in 2011 and 2012. Staff review of the budget has led to on-going work in three areas:

1. One proposed position cut would reduce the staffing available for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) from the current 2 FTE to 1 FTE. Concern has been expressed by representatives of the Coalition of City unions that reducing the City's ability to mediate situations at an early stage could lead to more costly formal disputes. In addition, the Office of Ethics and Elections has indicated that the ADR program has proven to be a useful

resource for addressing matters that are not actually City ethics issues, but rather personnel- or labor-related disputes. Staff is continuing to research the issue to determine whether 1 FTE is sufficient, or if other staff can take on some of the work.

2. Some additional staffing reductions were proposed through the Budget Issue Paper process, but were not implemented in the proposed budget. We are reviewing whether any of these additional reductions are feasible and/or advisable.
3. Lastly, there is on-going policy work in several Personnel-related areas that has been, or likely will be, of interest to Council. Staff anticipates preparing SLIs to clarify Council's anticipated role and overall expectations regarding each of these areas.
  - ***Review of centralized/decentralized human resource services.*** Last year Council passed a SLI requesting a review of how human resource services can most effectively be provided. The Executive asked each department to identify the number of staff dedicated to human resource issues and the specific role of each. This review led the Executive to propose the elimination of 15 FTE City-wide (in addition to the position cuts recommended for the Personnel Department). The Executive is committed to continuing this review during 2011, but significant changes will likely wait until Council confirms a permanent Personnel Director. In any case, Council may want to have Central Staff stay actively engaged in this effort.
  - ***Identification of workplace efficiencies.*** Consistent with the labor agreement recently approved by 17 of the 19 unions in the Coalition of City Unions, the City will use the Labor Management Leadership Committee (LMLC) to review management and employee suggestions for cost-saving changes in workplace processes, staffing models, scheduling, etc. A process needs to be developed to review and consider such proposals, and this will require coordination among the Executive, Council and participating labor unions.
  - ***Review of current APEX/SAM system.*** The Executive has indicated a desire to review this program, which has been in place for approximately 10 years. The goal of this review will be to determine whether the current program meets the City's classification and compensation needs. As the City's workforce evolves under more constrained revenues, system changes may be worth considering. Council should participate in this review. Funding is set aside in Finance General in support of this effort and the review of the centralized/decentralized human resource services.

---

## **Public Defense Contracting**

**Staff:** Peter Harris

**Legislation:** The Executive has proposed an ordinance that gives the Executive the ability to negotiate a reduced cost for the third of three public defense contracts, saving up to \$94,000 per year in the cost of the Indigent Public Defense BCL in Criminal Justice Contracted Services.

Ordinance 122602 requires the City to contract with three nonprofits specializing in indigent public defense: a primary provider; a secondary provider to handle conflict cases and others as assigned; and a third provider to represent defendants in which both the primary and secondary providers have a conflict of interest. It requires that the contract with the third provider provide a minimum of one full-time attorney. The proposed ordinance would remove the last requirement.

All other requirements of Ordinance 122602 would remain in effect, including those governing the selection of the third provider and the standards that apply to the services. The Executive still must obtain Council approval of the selection of all three providers.

The current contract with the third provider costs \$188,000 annually. The contract expires in June 2011 (along with the contracts for the first and second providers). The Executive believes it can obtain the necessary third provider services for half the current amount if it is allowed to contract for a half-time attorney rather than a full-time attorney. It proposes to renegotiate the current contract, and to issue an RFP for a new or extended contract for a half-time attorney for this service after June.

No amendments can be made to the current contract without the agreement of the contractor. The ability to obtain a third provider for a subsequent contract for a half-time attorney depends on finding a willing nonprofit that meets the other requirements of Ordinance 122602.

The proposed budget for Indigent Public Defense assumes the reduction of \$94,000 in each year. If the Council believes the Executive may not be able to negotiate the reduction in the current contract or obtain third provider services with a half-time attorney in a new contract, it can restore some or all of this reduction. However, an alternative approach would be to see whether such a negotiation is successful and to add funding in a supplemental if it is not.

---

## Scofflaw Enforcement – Proposed “booting” Program

**Staff:** Peter Harris

**Legislation:** The proposed budget includes legislation that would provide authority for the Seattle Municipal Court and the Seattle Police Department (SPD) to notify and immobilize vehicles with a new “booting” program for vehicles in scofflaw status. Scofflaws are vehicle owners with four or more outstanding parking infractions. The legislation would change City policy such that scofflaw vehicles found parked within public right-of-way could be immobilized with a boot. If past-due infractions and booting fee are not paid within 48 hours, then the vehicle could be towed. Either full payment a time-payment arrangement would be required before a vehicle would be released. The projected revenues and expenses associated with the program are summarized below.

Revenues		2011	2012
	Pro-Active Payers	\$ 833,000	\$ 513,000
	Booted Payers	\$ 694,000	\$ 1,195,000
	Increase Meter & Citation Compliance	\$ 330,000	\$ 670,000
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>		<b>\$ 1,857,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,378,000</b>
Expenses			
SPD	Personnel	\$ 272,000	\$ 345,000
	Equipment	\$ 192,000	\$ 20,000
SMC	Staffing	\$ 192,000	\$ 197,000
	Mailing	\$ 17,000	
SDOT	Education	\$ 65,000	\$ 20,000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>		<b>\$ 738,000</b>	<b>\$ 582,000</b>
<b>NET</b>		<b>\$ 1,119,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,796,000</b>

We are currently working to verify these financial estimates, but are not planning to conduct a more detailed policy review unless requested.

---

## Seattle Center – Summary

**Staff:** Sara Belz

**Summary:** The Mayor's 2011 Proposed Budget for Seattle Center reflects a -1.7% decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget. For 2012, the Proposed Budget calls for a 2.5% increase. This increase is generally the result of projected inflation, contractual obligations, and other technical adjustments. Under the 2011 Proposed Budget, approximately 39% of Seattle Center's expenses would be supported by the General Subfund with the remainder funded by lease proceeds, parking fees, events, and other revenue sources.

Proposed personnel changes for 2011 include abrogating 10 staff positions, reducing eight positions from full-time to part-time, and partially or fully defunding nine positions. The proposed staffing changes would decrease Seattle Center's total FTEs from 257.8 to 245.2, and save roughly \$1.4 million per year.

The 2011-2016 Proposed Capital Improvement Program includes \$9,216,000 for Seattle Center in 2011 and \$3,258,000 in 2012. Newly proposed capital projects include a \$3.4 million renovation of the Center House food court and a \$510,000 investment in energy efficiency enhancements. Both projects would be financed with City-issued Limited Tax General Obligation (LTGO) Bonds. In addition, the City's investment in the Center House project is expected to help leverage about \$7.5 million funding from donations and other private sources.

**Legislation:** Seattle Center's budget proposal is accompanied by two pieces of legislation:

- One bill would increase the range of parking rates Seattle Center could charge for non-event daily parking. Seattle Center currently has the authority to charge up to \$10 for any 10 hour period of non-event parking. The proposed legislation would increase that ceiling rate up to \$15. Presently, Seattle Center charges up to \$8 for non-event weekday parking and \$9 for non-event weekend parking. Seattle Center plans to raise these rates to \$9 and \$10, respectively. We asked about the potential to increase parking rates further as a means of generating additional revenue, but Center staff believes that higher rates would leave their lots uncompetitive relative to neighboring private facilities.
- The second piece of proposed legislation amends the fees and policies for events at Seattle Center. In particular, the legislation increases the ranges of fees that Seattle Center can charge for events at various facilities and also eliminate limits on the maximum number of days per year a single user may be authorized to use facilities. The purpose of this latter policy changes is to provide Seattle Center with additional flexibility to respond to market conditions, negotiate with commercial clients and sponsors, and maximize the numbers of events and revenue for the Department. The final version of this legislation has not yet been submitted, but we do not anticipate raising any significant policy issues. More broad

policy changes related to sponsorships have been removed from the proposal and will be taken up at a later date.

---

## **Seattle Office for Civil Rights (SOCR) – Summary**

**Staff:** Ben Noble

**Summary:** SOCR has responsibility for a number of important functions and program, including:

- Enforcement of City, state and federal anti-discrimination law;
- Leadership of the City’s Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI); and
- Staff support to four volunteer commissions – the Human Rights; Women’s; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender; and People with Disabilities Commissions.

In addition, the proposed budget expands the Office’s scope to include implementation the City’s Immigrant and Refugee Action Plan and support of the associated Advisory Board. This effort was previously staffed by one FTE in the Department of Neighborhoods. The proposed budget will reduce staffing to 0.5 FTE, but anticipates efficiencies from closing aligning the RSJI and Immigrant and Refugee programs as part of the move into SOCR.

I have identified two potential issues:

1. Elimination of a full-time paralegal who supports the 7.5 investigators dedicated to civil rights enforcement. Without this position available to assist the investigators, the average time to resolve cases is expected to grow from the current 140 days to an estimated 160 days. The current duties of the paralegal would be assigned to other staff in the enforcement unit. The position relies on approximately \$85,000 of annual General Fund support.
2. Elimination of 1 of the 2 staffers now assigned to support the four commissions listed above. Loss of this position will diminish the logistical and policy support available to the commissions. For example, staff no longer be able to attend all the sub-committee meeting of the commissions and will have less time to research potential policy recommendations. Commission vacancies might only be filled once a year as part of a coordinated recruitment effort. In addition, pro-active outreach to the communities represented by each of the commissions will be curtailed. Restoration of this General Fund supported position would costs \$114,000 per year.